A Pragma-Stylistic Study of Two Videos of Noah's "The Daily Show with Trevor Noah"

Haneen Kamil Shakeer Al-Watifi (M.A. Candidate)

haneen.shakeer@student.uobabylon.edu.iq. Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Babylon, Iraq.

Prof. Dunya Muhammed Miqdad I'jam

dunya.ijam@uobabylon.edu.iq. Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Babylon, Iraq.

Abstract

The present study tries to investigate the field of pragma-stylistics in talk shows, particularly, the American talk show "The Daily Show with Trevor Noah". It tries to find how the pragmatic theories are applied stylistically to reflect the speakers' perceptions and obtain their goals. The study aims at: 1) Specifying the most dominant between the politeness and impoliteness principles used by speakers in each video. 2) Identifying the videos speakers mostly use with politeness or impoliteness principles. 3) Showing the aims behind using politeness and impoliteness strategies. The present study is limited to two principles of pragmatics; politeness and impoliteness. The data of the analysis is limited to videos taken from the official channel of "The Daily Show with Trevor Noah". After analyzing the data, it is concluded that impoliteness principle is the most dominant in the analyzed videos. It is used by speakers to scorn the other and do a direct FTA against their negative face. Positive politeness and off-record politeness and positive impoliteness are mostly used in videos were Noah reports news and comment on them, while videos were Noah interviews a guest, off-record politeness, and positive impoliteness are mostly used. Speakers can achieve politeness and impoliteness strategies by employing the stylistic devices of metaphor, hyperbole, irony, repetition, allusion, quotation, and parody to achieve different aims and effects.

Keywords: pragma-stylistics, politeness, impoliteness, stylistic devices

Article Received: 10 August 2020, Revised: 25 October 2020, Accepted: 18 November 2020

1. Introduction

The study is concerned with investigating the field of pragma-stylistics in "The Daily Show with Trevor Noah". The study presents a theoretical review about two principles of pragmatics; politeness and impoliteness principle, by showing their stylistic effect, along with the stylistic devices. In addition to a concise account about social media, and talk shows, the study follows an eclectic model for the analysis of two video of The Daily Show.

The study is provided with tables that discuss the results. The aims of the study are proved by the end conclusions.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Pragma-stylistics

Pragma-stylistics alludes to the application of the findings and methodologies of pragmatics to the study of the notion of style in language (Allan, 2016: 217). The aim of pragma-stylistics, according to Sell (1991: 99), is "to relate the

writing and reading of literary texts to the linguistic and sociocultural contexts in which those processes have taken place. This means that it is literary on one hand and linguistic on the other with a great emphasis on contextualization". Pragma-stylistics involves investigating all the conditions that permit the rules of a language to collaborate with the specific components of the context to deliver a text fit for causing obvious changes in the hearer's perspective or knowledge (Davies, 2007: 106). Hickey (1989: 8, cited in D'hondt et

al., 2009: 23) states that the majority of the work in this approach depends on the instinctive examination, since the study of pragma-stylistics connects two distinct fields, each one works relying upon its own rules that are unique in relation to the other.

2.1.1 The Politeness Principle

The goal of S in any interaction should be to avoid FTA, which leads him to utilize a number of strategies that would help lessen the threat. In performing the strategies, S will take into consideration the relative assessment to three main wants: the content of FTA, how to communicate the FTA, namely, how to be urgent or efficient, and the want to save H's face want (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 68).

2.1.1.1 On-Record Politeness

S may go on-record (henceforth ONP), baldly and without a redressive action by acting in the most direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way possible. (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 68-69). Moreover, S can go on-record with a redressive action by giving face to H and indicating that he has no intention of causing any damage to H's face. This redressive action includes two main aspects, positive and negative politeness (Ibid).

2.1.1.2 Positive Politeness

Positive politeness (henceforth PP) is intended for the positive face want of H where S shows his consideration for H as a group member. The potential FTA is decreased by confirming that S wants at least some of H's wants (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 70). NP have three sub-strategies performed for redressing the FTA:

A. <u>Claiming common ground</u>: S may claim common ground with H by indicating that he shares with H the same wants, goals, and values (Ibid.: 103). This sub-strategy has the following outcomes:1) Noticing, attending to H's wants.2) Exaggerate the interest, approval or sympathy with H. 3) Intensifying interest to H. 4) Using in-group identity markers. 5) Seeking agreement. 6) Avoiding disagreement. 7) Raising common ground. 8) Using jokes.

B. <u>Conveying that S and H are cooperators</u>: S can convey the cooperative aspect between himself and H by indicating that they are both cooperating in the relevant activity (1987: 125). This can be achieved by employing the six mentioned outcomes: 1) Asserting or presupposing S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants. 2) Conveying offer/promise. 3) Being optimistic. 4) Including both S and H in the activity. 5) Giving (or asking for) reasons. 6) Assuming or asserting reciprocity (Ibid.: 125-129).

C. <u>Fulfilling H's wants for some X</u>: This includes S's knowledge of H's wants and his desire to achieve them to decrease the FTA. This can be obtained when S gives gifts to H which can be material gifts or moral ones, like showing his sympathy or understanding of H's condition and his cooperation with him (1987: 129).

2.1.1.3 Negative politeness

Negative politeness (henceforth NP), according to Brown and Levinson (1987: 129), is a set of strategies aiming at redressing the FTAs to H's negative face want of having an unhindered

freedom of action and unimpeded attention. Therefore, NP is avoidance-based, and S's interest is to assure that he recognizes and respects H's negative face wants and has no intention to threat His freedom of action. The FTA is redressed by apologizing for interfering or transgressing, with deference, hedges, impersonalizing mechanisms, and other methods that would soften the FTA (Ibid.: 70). NP has five super-strategies:

A- <u>Being direct</u>: To be on-record is to be direct. Therefore, to minimize the imposition on H in cases of formal politeness, S can get directly and rapidly to the point, avoiding any ambiguity (Ibid.: 130).

B- <u>Avoiding presuming or assuming</u>: S needs to avoid conveying the assumption that anything involved in the FTAs is desired or believed by H. This includes not assuming anything about H, his wants, or what is worthy of his attention. S can achieve this sub-strategy by using questions and hedges (Ibid.: 144).

C. <u>Communicating S's want to not impinge on H</u>: To satisfy H's negative face wants, S may communicate his awareness and consideration of them. By this way, S is implying that he is not threatening any infringement of H's territory. This can be achieved by two ways: 1) a direct apology for the infringement, and 2) an implicit indication of S's reluctance to impinge on H. (Ibid.: 187). The outcomes are:1) apologizing, 2) impersonalizing S and H, 3) stating the FTA as a general rule, and 4) nominalizing (Ibid.: 187-207).

2.1.1.4 Off-Record Politeness

By employing off-record politeness (henceforth OFP), S has the advantage of being thoughtful and non-coercive. He can reduce the chance for any face-damage interpretation, and give H the option to choose to be considerate of S's wants and willing to obtain them (Ibid.: 71).

A- <u>Inviting conversational implicatures:</u> This mechanism is based on breaching the maxims and inviting the implicatures to do the FTA indirectly. S can: 1) Give hints. 2) Give association clues. 3) Presuppose. 4) Understate. 5) Overstate. 6) Use contradictions. 7) Be ironic. 8) Use metaphor. 9) Use rhetorical questions. (Ibid.: 213).

B. <u>Being vague or ambiguous</u>: By violating the manner maxim, S can be vague so that his communicative intent remains unknown. He would appear to respect H's face and redress the FTA. S can be ambiguous by: 1) over-generalizing, 2) displacing H, and 3) being incomplete (Ibid, 1987: 225).

2.1.2   The Impoliteness Principle

Impoliteness (henceforth IMP) is "communicative strategies designed to attack face, and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony" (Culpeper et al. 2003: 1546). Culpeper (1996-2005) lists six impoliteness strategies:

2.1.2.1 Bald On-Record Impoliteness

During on-record impoliteness (henceforth ONIMP), S performs the FTA in a direct, clear, unambiguous, and concise way where he is not considering the other's face or interested in minimizing the FTA (Ibid., 1996: 356).

2.1.2.2 Positive Impoliteness

S uses positive impoliteness (PIMP henceforth) to destroy H's positive face wants (Ibid.:357). The outputs of this strategy are:1) Use inappropriate identity markers to describe others. 2) Use obscure language. 3) Seek disagreement and start sensitive topics (Ibid.: 357).

2.1.2.3 Negative Impoliteness

Negative impoliteness (NIMP henceforth) is oriented towards damaging the other's negative face (Ibid.: 356). Its main outputs are: 1) Condescend, scorn or ridicule the other. 2) Explicitly associate the other with negative aspects. 3) Personalizing using the pronouns 'I' and 'you' (Ibid.: 358).

2.1.2.4. Sarcasm or Mock Politeness

Mock politeness (MP henceforth) occurs when S performs FTAs using politeness strategies that are distinctly insincere, and hence the surface realization remains different from the deep meaning (Ibid.: 356).

2.1.2.5 Off-Record Impoliteness

Off-record impoliteness (henceforth OFIMP) performs the FTAs by implicating them. However, the real intention of the implicated FTA obviously overcast any others (Ibid., 2005: 44).

2.2 Stylistic Devices

2.2.1 Metaphor: It indicates the renaming of objects depending on the similarity or affinity (whether real or imaginary) of some properties shared between different objects (Zhukovska, 2010: 97). It is the process where a word or phrase, that literally indicates one object, is used in place of another to suggest a likeliness between them. (Merriam Webster).

2.2. 2 Hyperbole: It is "a purposeful overstatement or exaggeration of the truth to achieve intensity, or for dramatic or comic effect" (Zhukovska, 2010: 93). Overstating can be considered a hyperbole only when the exaggeration is intentional and both the speaker and audience are aware of it. It is also described as a distortion of the truth by saying too much (Wales, 2014: 161). Hence, hyperbole includes a violation of the quality maxim (Leech, 1983: 145).

2.2.3 Irony: It is simply saying the opposite (Wales, 2014hb: 352). It is the case where the actually used words seem to contradict the meaning actually required in the context, and its use can be intended by the speaker.

2.2.4 Repetition: It means using the same term frequently (Dupries, 1991:390). It is a type of deviation that breaks the normal rules of usage by its over-frequency. Repetitive patterns make an extreme imposition on the background of the expected normal usage and as a result, it attracts the attention (Wales, 2014: 167).

2.2.5 Allusion: It is the process of making an implicit or indirect reference to a person, event, a thing, or a part of a text (Zhukovska, 2010: 99). Most of the references used in allusion based on shared background between the audience and the speaker. Allusion can be used to contribute to the solemn, elevated and high–flown tonality of a text, but it may also be used to add ironic or humorous effects to the text (Ibid.).

2.2.6 Quotation: It is the process of citing words of others to highlight or to confirm a certain idea or viewpoint (Wales, 2014: 352). Quotation marks are employed to express or emphasize the direct speech or the unspoken ideas of others (Zhukovska, 2010: 42).

2.2.7 Parody: a literary or musical work in which the style of an author or work is closely imitated for comic effect or in ridicule. It is a feeble or ridiculous imitation (Merriam Webster). It also defined as the writing, music, art, speech, etc. that intentionally copies the style of someone famous or a particular situation, making the features or qualities of the original more noticeable in a way that is humorous (Cambridge English Dictionary).

2.3 Social Media and Political Discourse

Social media is defined as "internet-based sites and services that promote social interaction between participants" (Page et al., 2014: 5). Social media has altered the way people interact with each other and it has significantly transformed how they receive information and news on a daily basis (Adelugba, 2016). It has developed new ways for people to interact and exchange views on a broader sense, and this highlights the tremendous impact of social media (Carr, 2015). With the internet, the political landscape way people view political issues. In contrast with traditional media, social media increases the speed at which news are shared. It creates that ability to instantaneity publish and share the latest trending news that people can get at any time by accessing the different social media websites, like Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, etc. (Sattefield, 2020). Politicians have quickly got adapted to this new communication platform and used the social media as a tool for conveying their messages on a global scale and/or wielding influence to their advantage (Adelugba, 2016).

2.4 The Daily Show with Trevor Noah

The Daily Show is an American satirical television news show that has been airing on the Comedy Central network since 1966. It has first hosted by Craig Kilborn 1966-1998, and Jon Stewart 1999-2015 who had taken the show to reach its greatest popularity. Stewart had changed the show's direction to sharp political commentary and criticizing traditional media (Britannica, 2016). In 2015, Trevor Noah replaced Stewart who had retired from the program in August after a 16 year run (BBC News, 2015). It is introduced as a half-hour news program. The opening monologue is often a brief presentation of the day's main stories and events. This often includes some sarcastic or satirical punch lines, followed by a mockumentary feature which mixes clever and

frequent off-color reporting with unusual or newsworthy topics. The show ends with an interview segment with a celebrity or a major political figure (Britannica, 2016). Political satire programs are a win for democracy. Watching comedy encourages people to do a search about additional news information, and follows the course of political campaigns. In return, this would push young people to be more involved in politics (Becker, 2015).

3. Methodology

3.1 The Model of The Study

An eclectic model is followed to qualitatively analyzes the data. It contains: Brown's and Levinson's (1987) politeness principle with its three strategies and their sub-strategies: a) Positive politeness: Claim common ground, convey that H and S are cooperators, and fulfill H's wants. b) Negative politeness: Be direct, avoid assuming, and communicate that S does not want to impinge on H. c) Off record: Invite conversational implicatures and be vague. Along with Culpeper's (1996-2005) impoliteness principle with its six main strategies, however, this study is concerned with five of the strategies: bald on-record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, mock politeness, and bald off-record impoliteness. And Leech and Short (2007: 61-63) model that contains a practical checklist of four categories in linguistics and stylistics. As the present study is a pragma-stylistic one, the data will be stylistically analyzed using one category of the model, that is, the stylistic devices.

3.2 The Data of The Study

The present study includes an analysis of two videos of "The Daily Show with Trevor Noah", specifically, videos related to The Trump-Ukraine scandal. There is almost a two months gap between the two videos. The first Video was

aired on 26th of September, 2019, and the second video on 18th of November, 2019. In the first video, Noah reports the news and comments on them, while in the second video, he interviews Congressman John Himes.

3.2.1 The Trump-Ukraine Scandal

On the 12th of August, 2019, a whistleblower complaint about president Trump was released. It involved a promise that the U.S president, Donald Trump has made to a foreign leader, the newly elected president of Ukraine, Volodymyr Zelensky (Edelman, 2019). During the call, Mr. Trump asks his counterpart to "look into" the Democratic presidential candidate and one of the frontrunners to take Trump into the 2020 presidential election, Joe Biden as well as his son, Hunter Biden, who was a board member of a Ukrainian gas company (BBC News, 2019). The reason why Mr. Trump would do that is that he and his lawyer, Rudy Giuliani, were trying to make up a fake story and find dirt on his opponent, Mr. Biden and his son, to make him and his family look bad (Gienger and Goodman, 2020). The call came shortly after Mr. Trump blocked $391m (£316m) in military aid to Ukraine. Critics argued that this was used as a bargaining chip (BBC News, 2019), or quid pro quo. In return, The White House would make a visit to Ukraine and withhold the military aids that Ukraine needs to defend itself against the Russian aggression (Ibid.). The whistleblower alleged the U.S president used "the power of his office to solicit interference from a foreign country" in the 2020 presidential election. Because it is illegal to ask foreign entities for help in winning a US election.

4. Analysis and Discussion

4.1 Analysis of Video (1), 26th Sep, 2019

The following extracts are representative examples for the whole survey of analysis for the whole Video:

Extract No.1

Trump said that he would release a transcript of the phone call he had with Ukraine's president, and Trump claimed this transcript would prove that he is "so innocent, the most innocent person". But now we've all seen the transcript, and I'm starting to wonder if Trump even read it.

Yes, the transcript of the call is out. And not only did Trump definitely ask the president of Ukraine to work with his personal lawyer/vampire henchman to investigate Joe Biden, he also tried to rope in the United States attorney general. And if that happened, that's a big deal, because a president can't go around using the Justice Department as his personal TaskRabbit. That's not allowed, right ?… And you might be wondering, "If this phone call is so damning, why did Trump even release the transcript? Only an idiot would do that". Exactly.

Politeness

Noah uses a PP strategy of claiming common ground with the audience by making a joke out of Trump's claims of innocence. He quotes Trump's words in an imitative way. This way of quoting marks Noah's uses of an OFP strategy of giving hints to invite CONVER-I that implicates that he does not believe Trump to be innocent. He uses person deixis "we" as a PP strategy to include everyone in the activity and exclude Trump. He uses a PP strategy of seeking agreement with the reporter by repeating what he says; "*the transcript is out*". He uses indirect speech to repeat what the reporter says to emphasize that it is now proved that Trump and his lawyer, Giuliani, were both communicating with the president of Ukraine. Moreover, Trump was trying to persuade the U.S. attorney general to take a decision in his favor. Noah uses the word "*definitely*" as an OFP strategy to invite CONVER-I emphasizing that it has been proven with a clear evidence. He uses an OFP of violating the manner maxim by being vague and untruthful in his description when saying "*lawyer/vampire henchman*" referring to

Trump's lawyer Rudy Giuliani. He also operates an OFP strategy of using metaphor, "*lawyer/vampire henchman*", to associate Giuliani to a Vampire and a henchmen to indicate that Giuliani is a venal follower of Trump. Noah uses an OFP strategy of giving association clues when he describes the Justice Department as Trump's "TaskRabbit", an American online marketplace that allows customers to find immediate help with everyday tasks, to invite a CONVER-I to imply that Trump is trying to use the Justice Department to achieve his personal needs. He uses an OFP strategy of using metaphor, "*an idiot*", to associate Trump to a foolish stupid person. Noah then uses PP by the rhetorical question "*right?*" to seek his audience's agreement. Noah uses a PP strategy of noticing his audience's wants of an answer to the question and seeking agreement with the audience by directly quoting their question. Noah uses a PP strategy of seeking agreement with the audience when he agrees with them "*Exactly*".

Impoliteness

Noah uses a PIMP strategy of calling Trump's name. Noah quotes Trump's words in an imitative way. This is why the use of quotation in this context implies MP that indicates Noah's insincerity; he does not believe and is not convinced in the sincerity of Trump's claims of innocence, since there are strong evidences that prove Trump deserving of an impeachment. He uses PIMP strategies of excluding Trump from the activity and seeking disagreement with him. He uses PIMP by first using derogatory noun "*lawyer/vampire henchman*" to insult Giuliani, and second by selecting a sensitive topic when talking about Trump and Giuliani's secret communication with the Ukrainian president and Trump's attempts to persuade the attorney general, and third by using inappropriate identity markers to describe Giuliani. He uses NP strategies of impersonalizing Trump and stating

the FTA as a general rule when he says "*a president*", with an indefinite article "*a*" and without naming Trump to highlight the general rule which all presidents should follow, including Trump. He uses an OFIMP strategy of performing the FTAs by implicating them when he implicates that Trump uses his power to seek the support of the Justice Department. He uses a NIMP strategy of scorning Trump when he calls him "*an idiot*". This is also a PIMP strategy of using inappropriate identity markers to describe Trump.

Stylistic Devices

Noah uses the stylistic device of quoting the phrase "*so innocent*" to refer to Trump describing his call as "a very innocent call". He adds "*the most innocent person*" to refer to Trump's seemingly made up story about his friends who describe him as "the most innocent guy ever to hold this office", and describing himself as "an innocent man" during the investigation into the Russian interference of 2016 elections. He quotes Trump's words without using any of the quoting verbs and with him imitating the sound and the way Trump speaks which is a stylistic device of parody. Calling Giuliani as "lawyer/vampire henchman" is a stylistic device of metaphor, and of hyperbole since Noah is exaggerating in his description to produce a strong impression that he holds against Giuliani as a Vampire and a henchmen to indicate that Giuliani is a venal follower of Trump. Stylistically, describing the Justice Department as a "*TaskRabbit*" functions as a simile. Noah uses a quotation of a question that he believes his audience are asking about the reason why Trump releases his call transcript when it works against his case. Quotation is stylistically used to express the unspoken ideas of the audience. Noah uses metaphor to associate Trump to "*an idiot*".

Extract No. 2

Yes, the software that monitors the president's calls writes it down, and then someone checks it. And can I just say I feel so bad for whatever voice recognition software has to try and make sense of what Donald Trump is saying. Cause, you realize, that computer is programmed to recognize normal human speech patterns, not the Donald. He's just out there like, "And, so, I say, I SAY, "they were so big. NOT as big. Electoral college. "CHINA. THE wall. BIG time. "Bigly and all. That's me." Yeah, honestly, the computer probably listens for ten seconds to Trump, and then it just throws itself into a bathtub like, "Kill me." (laughter and applause)

So, look, the transcript is bad. But as bad as this seems for Trump, this transcript has turned into a political Rorschach. Right? Democrats see a smoking gun that proves Donald Trump abused his power and deserves to lose his job. Republicans see a man who's innocent and is just passionate about cracking down on corruption in Ukraine. And I see my dad forgetting my birthday, even though we were born on the same day. So, if you're on Team Trump, this transcript wasn't a disaster--it was a total win.

Politeness

Noah uses a PP strategy of seeking agreement with the reporter by repeating the reported news. He repeats the reporter's explanation of the process of making the transcript. He uses a PP strategy of asserting common ground with the audience when he says "*you realize*" as a point of view flip. Noah uses PP with his audience by telling the computer joke to build common ground with them and to indicate that he and his audience belong to the same group which is a group against Trump. He uses metaphor as an OFP strategy to invite CONVER-I which implicates that the U.S. politicians have totally different views about the transcript. Namely, two different views: the Democrats' and the Republicans'. He uses the idiom "*smoking gun*" as a metaphor referring to the transcript, as an OFP strategy of inviting CONVER-I, to implicate that the Democrats consider the transcript as crime evidence against Trump. He uses an OFP when he violates the manner

maxim by being vague when he uses the word "*a man*", with an indefinite article, referring to Trump who is seen by the Republicans as an innocent man. Noah uses an OFP strategy of overstating when he uses the word "*passionate*" to imply that the Republicans want the public to believe that Trump is an honest man who is entirely innocent of corruption, and that his main goal is to clear Ukraine of it. He uses a PP strategy of using jokes, "*and I see my dad…*", to claim common ground with his audience.

Impoliteness

Noah uses a NIMP strategies of calling Trump's name and scorning him when he explains that Trump's way of speaking is so difficult to manage even for a computer. He performs a Direct FTA against Trump's negative face, using the ONIMP strategy to insult Trump. Noah uses a PIMP strategy of disassociating Trump from all the human. This is emphasized by him saying "*not the Donald*". He uses a NIMP strategy of seeking disagreement with Trump. Noah predicts how the computer might act after listening to Trump. He uses an ONIMP strategy of insulting Trump. Noah uses NIMP of making Trump feel uncomfortable. Noah uses an ONIMP strategy of performing the FTA in a direct and clear way to attack Trump. He uses "*so*" to indicate that after all the case being revealed, the conclusion is that the Transcript is bad. Noah argues that there are different views on the transcript. He uses a PIMP strategies of calling Trump's name and seeking disagreement with and starting sensitive topics, "*Donald Trump abused his power*". Noah is using MP as he is insincere when describing Trump as an innocent man who is fighting corruption in Ukraine. Noah uses an OFIMP strategy of attacking Trump by the indirect speech of the Democrats.

Stylistic Devices

He then uses hyperbole, highlighting the physical qualities of Trump voice, stating that he does not have a normal human speech pattern. Noah implicates that Trump has his own speech pattern that is totally different from that of humans. This is emphasized by him saying "*not the Donald*". He uses a stylistic device of quoting and parody of Trump's speech and imitating, in the sense of mocking, his style of speaking. Noah uses high and low voice pitches and he also jumps between totally different subjects without sticking to one or finishing one before going to the other. He uses hyperbole when he exaggerates describing the computer's attitude towards Trump's pitch voice and his style of speaking. Noah uses hyperbole to emphasize the idea that Trump has a strange and hard to follow style of speaking. Noah uses repetition of the word "*bad*" to highlight ONIMP and the idea that Trump's call and his deal with Zelensky is totally unaccepted and wrong. Noah argues that there are different views on the transcript. Noah uses metaphor to associate the call transcript to a Rorschach test which is viewed in different ways by different individuals. Noah states that the Democrats consider Trump guilty of corruption and the call transcript is their evidence to use in Trump's impeachment. Noah uses the idiom "*smoking gun*" as a metaphor referring to the transcript implying that the Democrats consider the transcript as crime evidence against Trump.

Extract No. 3

"That's right, folks. There's no quid pro quo. Because I would never speak Latin on my calls." So, in a nutshell, that was day two on the road to impeachment. The White House released the transcript, Congress has officially received the full whistleblower's report and we'll have to wait to find out what happens next. And it could be anything. We could find out that Mike Pence also pressured Ukraine on a call or we could find out the secret identity of the whistleblower. Spoiler alert, I think it's Tekashi69. Guy's snitching on everybody.(applause)

Until then, until then, we don't know anything. What we do know is that Trump's defenders have already decided on their big talking point and that is that this whole thing is a nothing-burger because there was no explicit quid pro quo. In other words, President Trump may have asked the Ukrainian leader for a favor, but he didn't say, "Do the favor or no military support."
But let's-let's be honest. Like, you don't need to be explicit to set up a shady deal. (36) I mean, if you've ever watched any Mafia anythings, you'll know that explicit is the exact opposite of what they do.

Politeness

By being irrelevant, Noah uses an OFP to invite CONVER-I implicating Noah's reference to the Latin mafia, since any mafia uses extortion as a basic principle. Hence, Noah is implicating that Trump follows mafia ways and principles to get his goals. He uses person deixis "*we*" as a PP strategy of including himself with his audience to claim common ground with them. He uses the inclusive '*we*' as a PP strategy to indicate that he is, like the audience, waiting to see what happens next. Noah asserts that the possibility is open for anything to happen. Noah's violation of relevance maxim by referring to Tekashi 69, who is a rap singer, expecting him to be the whistleblower, aims at throwing a joke to his audience which is a PP strategy to claim common ground with his audience. Noah uses person deixis "*we*" twice as a PP strategy of including himself and the audience, implicating that he too, like his audience, does not know anything about the case, other than what has been revealed so far. He violates the manner maxim by being vague and using "*a shady deal*" as an OFP strategy to invite CONVER-I to implicate that Trump's deal with Ukraine is a shady one. Noah uses an OFP strategy of being incomplete when he mentions "*Trump's defenders*" to refer to the Republicans.

Impoliteness

Noah uses an OFIMP strategy of attacking Trump by implicating that only mafias do a quid pro quo, since most of the mafia are known to be Latinos, which makes Trump a man of mafia. He uses a PIMP strategy of calling other's names when he mentions Mike Pence, the vice president, expecting that Pence may have involved in the case. He uses an ONIMP strategy of accusing Trump's defenders for making an agreement concerning what idea they should promote which would results in benefit for them and, most importantly, for Trump. The point they have agreed upon is that the whole, the Trump-Ukrainian scandal and the transcript case, are insufficient, not worthy of all the attention, and does not prove anything against Trump. The Republicans want to prove that Trump did not commit an extortion and that he never meant it to be. Noah quotes the exact words that Trump has implied in his calls with the Ukrainian as an ONIMP strategy that proves Trump committing a quid pro quo act "*Do the favor or no military support*". He uses an ONIMP strategy of indirectly rebutting Trump's claims by stating a fact, that to do a shady deal means being anything but explicit. By stating that a shady deal should not be explicit, Noah is performing an indirect speech act of accusing Trump of doing a shady deal with the Ukrainian. He uses PIMP strategies by seeking disagreement with Trump's defenders and their claim that it was not an extortion because it was not explicitly stated, and he is starting a sensitive topic, that is of a quid pro quo. He also uses a NIMP strategy of associating Trump with negative aspects; the shady deal. Noah uses an OFIMP of accusing Trump of being a Mafia man who does shady deals. He uses NIMP strategy of associating Trump with a negative aspect; the Mafia.

Stylistic Devices

Noah employs parody as a stylistic device to imitate Trump's style of speech in the sense of mocking. He uses the expression "*the road to impeachment*" which is an allusion that indicates that the impeachment case is long and complicated. It also indicates that the transcript is evidence that has opened the road for the Democrats to impeach Trump. Noah uses quotation as a stylistic device to convey what Trump and his supporters say of a quid pro quo. He uses allusion to describe the scandal as "a nothing-burger", which is a term used in the media to describe something as irrelevant and insignificant. He uses the stylistic device of indirect quotation of Trump defenders' claims; Trump did ask for a favor but did not tell the Ukrainian that if they didn't help him, he would not give them the military support that they need to defend their lands against the Russian attacks. In other words, Trump's defenders claim that Trump did not commit an extortion.

4.2 Analysis of Video (2), 18th Nov., 2019

The following extracts are representative examples for the whole survey of analysis for the whole Video:

Extract No. 1

Noah: Welcome back to the show. The first public impeachment hearings are in a couple of days. Uh, in the planning of this event, this is gonna be huge, have you thought of getting that guy who's gonna come and be like, "Let's get ready to rumble." Have you thought of that?
Himes: I was just working on getting Anna Kendrick to come join us, 'cause, you know, that, that will improve our rating.

Noah: It is a big—It is a really, really big moment, not just for Congress, but for America as a whole. Now, as we saw in that clip, you believe that Donald Trump has done something that is an impeachable offense. Many Democrats do, in fact, more than half of the country believes in impeachment. Why do you think this was an impeachable offense?

Politeness

Noah uses PP strategies of using "gonna" as an in-group identity marker, making a joke, and starting small talk with Himes to claim common ground. Noah uses the phrase "*Let's get ready to rumble*" which is famously used in boxing sport to indicate the beginning of the fight. He uses this phrase as an OFP strategy to give association clue implicating that the hearings will be a battle between two parties, the Republicans and the Democrats. Himes uses an OFP strategy when he violates manner maxim by being ambiguous about his reference to actress Anna Kendrick. The actress is a guest on the show and she is to be interviewed after the congressman on the same episode, so referring to her serves as an OFP strategy of giving a hint to indirectly introduce her on the show. He violates quality maxim by not being truthful as an OFP strategy to invite a CONVER-I implicating that it is not Anna who will improve the ratings, but it is the reason of holding this event; to impeach the president of the United States for his scandal with Ukraine. This is already big news that makes a great publicity. Noah uses person deixis "*we*" to include himself, Himes, and the audience as a PP strategy to convey that they are cooperators. He uses an OFP to invite CONVER-I of the word "many" and of the overstatement in "*more than half*" implicating that a large number of people believe in impeachment. This is emphasized by him saying "more than half" to be informative in his claim. He also employs hyperbole by his use of the OFP strategy of overstating, "*more than half*". Noah's use of hyperbole "It is a really big moment", "more than half", and repetition of the word "believe" is an OFP strategy of giving hints that he believes of Trump's impeachment.

Impoliteness

Noah uses a PIMP strategy of calling Trump's name to attack his positive face want by disrespecting Trump's title as a president. He uses an ONIMP by performing the FTA against Trump's positive face in a direct, clear, and unambiguous way by stating that Trump deserves to be impeached. He emphasizes the FTA by stating that "*You believe… many Democrats do… in fact more than half of the country believes in impeachment*". He uses a PIMP by excluding Trump form the rest of the country. Noah employs indirect suggestion by means of asking to communicate that he does not want to impinge on the congressman so he employs NP to mitigate his suggestion

Stylistic Devices

Noah uses the phrase "*Let's get ready to rumble*" which is famously used in boxing sport to indicate the beginning of the fight. This phrase is an allusion that Noah uses to associate the hearings to a battle. He uses rhetorical question as a way of building his allusion. He uses repetition of his question as a stylistic device to put emphasize on it. Himes' statement "*That will improve our ratings*" is an irony since Trump's impeachment inquiry is a historical event that does not need any more publicity than it already has. Himes repeats the word "*that*" twice which stylistically works as a repetition to emphasize his next utterance. Noah uses hyperbole "*more than half*" in describing the hearings to achieve intensity and a dramatic effect. He uses repetition of the words "*big*" and "*really*" to attract his guest's and audience's attention, and to put emphasis on the utterance. He uses repetition of the word "*believes*" to intensify that most of the American people are confident that Trump deserves to be impeached.

Extract No. 2

Himes: Well, there's two things going on here that are impeachable. Number one is a corrupt abuse of power. And that's the difference between Donald Trump, as you just saw in that clip, uh, extorting, essentially, a foreign leader, a vulnerable foreign leader, as we speak, the Ukrainians are fighting the Russians, and saying, as he so gracefully put it, "We

want you to do us a favor, though." And, of course, at the same time, military aid is being held up, and a meeting in the White House--which is a big deal for the new president of Ukraine--is being held up. Um, that is--- It has nothing to do with our foreign policy. It has everything to do with the personal political interest of the president of the United States. And I don't care if you're a Republican or a Democrat, that is not okay. The other piece of this, of course, is we have an ambassador. And the American public is gonna hear from her on Friday. All three witnesses, diplomats who are as sharp, patriotic, serving under Democrtic and Republican administrations over the many, many years, veterans, in some cases, uh, who was fired. She was fired because some weird combination of Rudy Giuliani and shady folks in Ukraine decided that she wasn't on Donald Trump's team. -Mm-hmm. And that just can't happen.

Politeness

Himes accuses Trump of using his power to extort the Ukrainian President, whom Himes describes using the phrase "*a vulnerable foreign leader*" as an OFP strategy of inviting CONVER-I to implicate that the Ukrainian President is weak and unable to fight the Russians and Trump has taken advantage of that by using his power to extort Zelensky. Himes uses a PP strategy of exaggerating his interest and sympathy with the Ukrainian President to claim common ground. He uses an OFP strategy by being ironic when he mentions "extortion" and the adverb "gracefully" to criticize Trump of being ironic for doing acts of corruption and at the same time acting gracefully about it. So Trump is contradicting himself. This is emphasized by Trump's ironic use of the word "favor" to call the Ukrainians' interference in U.S elections in return of military support, which is best described as an extortion, since Trump has withheld military aid from Ukraine to get their help in winning the elections. Himes describes Zelensky as "*the new President of Ukraine*" as an OFP strategy of inviting CONVER-I to implicate that Trump has taken

advantage of that, especially when looking at the fact that a new President is often a weak President with a little or no experience in dealing with big problems, like the Russian attack. So as a new President, Zelensky is seeking help from Trump and the latter is blocking that help by holding up the meeting to push Zelensky to dig dirt on Biden and his son. Zelensky is in a weak position and Trump is the one with power and is using his power to extort Zelensky. He criticizes Trump for doing corruption as what he did lies not in the benefit of America's foreign policy but in the benefit of Trump's personal political interest. He uses an OFP of giving hints when he calls Trump by his position title, "*the President of the United States*", which is aimed as reminder for the public that Trump is the President of the United States and so what he has done is utterly wrong, illegal, and unacceptable for a anyone, especially for a President. Himes uses person deixis "we" as PP strategies to include everyone in the activity and using in-group identity marker "gonna" to claim common ground with the public. He uses a PP strategy of claiming common ground with the three witnesses, including the American ambassador to Ukraine, by noticing their wants, exaggerating interest, approval, and sympathy with them for being fired from her rule as an ambassador in Trump's government before the hearings begin.

Impoliteness

Himes uses PIMP strategy by starting sensitive topics to destroy Trump's positive face wants accusing him of the corrupt abuse of power. Himes uses a PIMP strategies of seeking disagreement and starting sensitive topics with Trump (holding up military aid and a meeting with Zelensky) to destroy Trump's positive face want. Himes uses PIMP of starting sensitive topics when referring to Trump's abuse use of power to achieve his personal political goals. He uses a PIMP strategies of seeking disagreement

and starting sensitive topics with Trump's lawyer, Giuliani, and some of Trump's supporters in Ukraine who decided to move the ambassador from her position because she was weakening Trump's efforts to pressure Ukraine into investigating his political rival Joe Biden. He uses a NIMP strategy of personalizing when he uses the pronoun "I" to refer to himself, and "you" to address everyone. He states that everyone, Republicans and Democrats, should refuse Trump's act of corruption. He uses ONIMP strategy to perform an FTA against Giuliani and Trump's supporters by being direct, clear, unambiguous, and concise. Himes performs PIMP strategy of using inappropriate identity markers to describe Giuliani and Trump's supports in Ukraine, calling them "*some weird combination*" and "*shady folks*". He also uses NIMP strategy, "*some weird combination*", to scorn and ridicule Giuliani and Trump's supporters in Ukraine. This is also an ONIMP strategy to directly insult them. He uses allusion "*shady folks*" to imply that Trump's supporters have a bad reputation. Himes uses an ONIMP strategy of performing the FTA in a direct, clear, and concise way against Trump, his lawyer, and his supporters in Ukraine.

Stylistic Devices

Himes uses repetition "*a foreign leader, a vulnerable foreign leader*" to intensify his interest to and sympathy with Zelensky and the idea that Trump has done corruption by using his power to press a foreign leader to interfere in U.S elections. He has extorted the Ukrainians; help them win the war, in return, they help him win the elections. He uses quotation of Trump's words as an evidence of extortion. Himes uses an irony against Trump when he mentions "*extortion*" which Trump calls it a "*favor*". Himes uses the stylistic device of repeating the phrase "*is being held up*" to intensify Trump's act of extortion. He uses "*at the same time*" to indicate that Trump calls the Ukrainian help "*a*

favor", and at the same time, he is holding up the help from Ukraine waiting for their decision to accept his deal, and this is just how extortion works. Himes uses hyperbole "*It has nothing to do with…. It has everything to do with…*" to intensify the idea of Trump's corrupted act. Himes uses the stylistic devices of repetition of "*many, many years*" to emphasized that these witnesses have served for a long time and were loyal to the government and its institutions, however, their service was un appreciated by Trump and his government.

Extract No. 3

Noah: Let me ask you about the Republican colleagues. They've said it's not about that. You know, people like Lindsey Graham have said, "No, this whole impeachment thing is incorrect. This is not how you should be removing a president. A president should be removed by the people in an election." That's what they say. "Let's let the American people decide, because this impeachment thing feels like a witch hunt." How do you respond to that criticism from their side?

Himes: Well, the statement... So, Lindsey Graham called the impeachment process illegitimate. Folks on the right are calling it a coup. This is a specifically enumerated remedy, in the Constitution of the United States that we all swear to uphold, for holding the president accountable. By the way, it turns out, if you read the Mueller report, uh, that it's the only way to hold the president accountable, because under the opinion of the Department of Justice, the president can't be charged with a crime. Right. So it is the only way. It is the constitutional way that we hold a president accountable. Um, and so, too, again, attack that process and to call it a "coup", you know, that sound you hear is the cornerstones of our system beginning to erode a little bit. Oh. It sounds like there's gonna be a showdown. From Wednesday onwards, America will never be the same.

Politeness

Noah uses a strategy of repeating Himes words "*the Republican colleagues*" as a PP strategy of seeking agreement with Himes. Noah uses an

OFP when he quotes the article "*a*", in "*a president*", as a CONVER-I to implicate that Graham is trying to state a general rule and to make it appear that he is fair and not choosing a side, and that he is not saying that just to support and protect Trump. However, the reality is different. He uses the person deixis "we" as a PP strategy to include all the House Representatives. He uses an OFP strategy when he says "specifically" as a CONVER-I to invite the implicature that there is no other way to deal with what the president did but to hold him accountable and make him pay for the damage he caused. He emphasizes his statement by referring to the constitution to indicate that the Democrats took this procedure since they are following the constitution which they swore to uphold. Himes uses an OFP strategy of understating "*a little bit*" to be truthful but not coercive.

Impoliteness

Noah uses a PIMP strategy of calling other's names by mentioning Lindsey Graham. In his quoted words, Graham uses an ONIMP strategy of performing the FTA in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way. In the quotation of the Republicans, they use "*witch hunt*" which is an OFIMP to perform the FTA indirectly attacking the Democrats. Stylistically, they use simile to be likened the impeachment to a witch hunt. Himes uses a PIMP strategy of calling Graham's name. He uses an OFIMP strategy of implicating the FTA against Trump when he

mentions "*folks*" implicating his reference to Trump when he said that the impeachment is a coup. Himes uses OFIMP strategy; he omits the subjects of the verbs "*attack*" and "*call*" to indirectly attack Graham and Trump and the Republicans. He uses an OFIMP strategy of performing the FTA by implicating them when he indirectly accuses Trump and the Republicans of consuming the cornerstones of the system. Himes uses "*the president can't be charged with a crime*" as a NP strategy of stating the FTA as a general rule to communicate that he does not want to impinge on Trump and the Republicans.

Stylistic Devices

Noah uses a stylistic device of quoting Graham's and the Republicans' words to highlight their attitude of the impeachment inquiry. He uses metaphor when he associates the impeachment to "*a specifically enumerated remedy*". Himes uses metaphor to associate the impeachment to a "*remedy*". He uses a stylistic device of repeating the same utterance "*it is the only way*", and "*to hold a president accountable*" to emphasize the NP that Trump cannot be impeached any other way. He uses hyperbole "*that sound you hear*" to achieve dramatic effect and intensity the FTA. He uses allusion, "*showdown*", as a stylistic device to imply that the impeachment hearings will be an important argument between the Republicans and the Democrats and it would end the disagreement between them concerning Trump'simpeachment.

5. Results

5.1 Discussing the Results of Politeness and Impoliteness in Both Videos

Table.1 The rations, percentages and differentials of politeness in both videos

Videos	PP		NP		OFP		Total	
	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.

Video (1)	14	23.3	1	1.66	13	21.66	28	56
Video (2)	6	14.63	2	4.87	14	34.14	22	44
							50	100
Differentials	8	42.10	1	5.26	1	5.26	10	20

The three strategies of politeness are used in both videos with different percentages. However, they are used in the first video more than in the second one with a ration of (28, 56%) in the first video, and (22, 44%) in the second video. The most dominant politeness strategies are PP with a ratio of (14, 23.3%), and OFP with

a ratio of (13, 21.66%) in video2, and (14, 34.14%) in video2. NP is the lowest in both videos with a ration of (1, 1.66%) in video1, and (2, 4.87%) in video2. Hence, the mostly used strategies are PP with a differential of (8, 42.10%) in video1, and OFP with a differential of (1, 5.26%) used equally in both videos.

Table.2 The rations, percentages and differentials impoliteness in both videos

Videos	ONIMP		PIMP		NIMP		OFIMP		MP		Totals	
	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.
Video (1)	6	18.75	14	43.75	6	18.75	4	12.5	2	6.25	32	61.54
Video (2	5	25	10	50	2	10	3	15	0	0	20	38.46
											52	100
Differentials	1	8.33	4	33.3	4	33.3	1	8.33	2	16.6	12	23.16

Four of impoliteness strategies are used in both videos. However, they are used in the first video more than in the second one with a ration of (32, 61.54%) in video1, and (20, 38.46%) in video2. ONIMP is used with approximate rations of (6, 18.75%), and (5, 25%) in video1 and video2 respectively. PIMP is used more in video1 with a ration of (14, 43.75%), than in video2 with a

ration of (10, 50%). NIMP is also used more in video1 with a ration of (6, 18.75%), than it is used in video2 with a ration of (2, 10%). OFIMP is used more in video1 with a ration of (4, 12.5%) than in video2 with a ration of (3, 15%). MP is used only in the first video with a ration of (2, 6.25%). The mostly used impoliteness strategies are PIMP in both videos with a differential of (4, 33.3%), and NIMP in video1 with the same differential.

5.2 Discussing The Results of Stylistic Devices in Both Videos

Table.3 The rations, percentages and differentials of stylistic devices of both videos

Videos	Metaphor		Hyperbole		Irony		Repetition		Allusion		Quotation		Parody		Total	
	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.
Video (1)	4	20	3	15	1	5	1	5	1	5	6	30	3	15	21	52.5

Video (2)	2	10	3	15.78	2	10.5	8	42.1	2	10.5	2	10.5	0	0	19	47.5
															40	100
Differentials	2	100	0	0	1	50	7	350	1	50	4	200	3	150	2	5

The use of the stylistic devices is more in video1 than it is in video2 with rations of (21, 52.5%), and (19, 47.5%), respectively. Metaphor and quotation are mostly used in video1 with rations of (4, 20%), and (6, 30%) respectively. Repetition is the highest used device found in video2 with a ration of (8), (42.1%) and a differential of (7, 350%). Hyperbole is used in both video with an approximant frequency of (3) and percentages of (15%) in video1, and (15%) in video2. Parody is found only in video1 with a ration of (3, 15%).

5. Conclusions

Conclusions are drawn from the analysis of the present data, to achieve the aims of the study.

1. The first aim of the study reads as *specifying the most dominant between the politeness and impoliteness principles used by speakers in both videos*, is achieved since the impoliteness principle is the most dominant principle used in both videos, in contrast to the politeness principle which is used less.

2. The second aim which reads as *identifying the videos speakers mostly use with politeness and impoliteness principles*, is achieved since politeness and impoliteness strategies are mostly

used in videos where Noah reports news and comments on them.

3. The third aim which reads as *showing the aims behind using the stylistic devices to achieve the effects of politeness and impoliteness strategies*, is achieved since metaphor is used as

an OFP strategy to invite CONVER-I. Hyperbole is used to achieve the effect of exaggerating a politeness or impoliteness strategy of expressing an attitude, emotion, or idea. Repetition is used to achieve the effect of intensifying a statement as a PP strategy of seeking an agreement. Quotation is used to perform a PP strategy of quoting other's words to seek agreement with him or it is used to perform an FTA against others by quoting the other's words to criticize and attack him. Parody is used as a PM strategy to mock other by imitate him in a comic way to indirectly scorn, insult, and make fun of him. Irony is used to achieve the strategy of OFP of implicating that the other is contradicting himself. Allusion is used to associates individuals to negative aspects to perform an FTA.

6. References

1. Allan, K. Ed. (2016). *The Routledge Handbook of Linguistics*. New York. Routledge.
2. Brown, G., and S. Levinson. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. New York. Cambridge University Press.
3. Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 355-8.
4. Culpeper, Derek, B. and Anne W. (2003). Impoliteness revisited: With special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 1545-1579.
5. Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and The Weakest

Link. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1 (July): 35-72.

6. Davies, A. (2007). *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics: From Practice to Theory. 2nd ed.* Ed. Davies, A., and Keith M. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

7. D'hondt, S., Östman J., and Jef, V. (2009). *The Pragmatics of Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/hoph.4

8. Dupries, B. (1991). A Dictionary of Literary Devices. Halsall, A.W. (Trans). New York: University of Toronto Press.

9. Leech, G.N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

10. Leech, G., and M. Short. (2007). *Style in Fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose*. 2nd ed. New York. Longman.

11. Page, R., Barton, D., Unger, J. and Zappavigna, M. (2014). *Researching Language and Social Media:* A Student Guide. New York: Routledge.

12. Sell, R. D. Ed. (1991). *Literary Pragmatics*. London and New York: Routledge.

13. Wales, K. (2014). *A Dictionary of Stylistics*. 3rd ed. London: Longman.

14. Zhukovska, V. (2010). English Stylistics: Fundamentals of theory and practice. Zhytomyr: Zhytomyr I. Franko State Univerity.

15. **Web Sources**

16. Adelugba, R. (2016). The role of Social Media in Contemporary Politics. Apr 11. Last retrieved, Nov.14, 2020.

17. https://pdgc2015a.wordpress.com/2016/04/11/the-role-of-social-media-in-contemporary-politics/

18. BBC News. Trevor Noah to replace Jon Stewart on The Daily Show. Mar. 31, 2015. Last retrieved, Aug. 2, 2019.

19. https://www.bbc.com/news/entertainment-arts-32114257

20. BBC News. (2019). Trump impeachment: The short, medium and long story. Last retrieved, Sep.5, 2020.

21. https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-49800181

22. Becker, A. (2015). Political satire makes young people more likely to participate in politics. Trevor Noah's The Daily Show is likely to continue that trend. In LSE U.S. Central. Apr 3. Last retrieved, Oct 14, 2020

23. https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/usappblog/2015/04/03/political-satire-makes-young-people-more-likely-to-participate-in-politics-trevor-noahs-the-daily-show-is-likely-to-continue-that-trend/

24. Britannica. The Daily Show: An American television program. Apr. 29, 2016. Last retrieved, Oct 10, 2020

25. https://www.britannica.com/topic/The-Daily-Show

26. Carr, N. (2015). How Social Media is Ruining Politics. Sep 2. Last retrieved, Oct 20, 2020

27. http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2015/09/2016-election-social-media-ruining-politics-213104

28. Carrol County Times Opinion. Edelman: Innocent People don't act the way President Trump has acted regarding Ukraine scandal. Nov. 5, 2019. Last retrieved Aug. 5. 2020

29. https://www.baltimoresun.com/maryland/carroll/opinion/cc-op-edelman-110519-20191105-wcxxo2nm6vcxnnqro7u5xiatom-story.html

30. Gienger, V. and Goodman, R. (2020). Timeline: Trump, Giuliani, Biden, and Ukrainegate (updated). Last retrieved, Nov.13, 2020.

31. https://www.justsecurity.org/66271/timeline-trump-giuliani-bidens-and-ukrainegate/

32. Satterfield, H. (2020). How Social Media Affects Politics. Mar 11. Last retrieved, Dec.11, 2020.

33. https://www.meltwater.com/en/blog/social-media-affects-politics

34. Dictionaries

35. Merriam Webster Dictionary

36. Cambridge English Dictionary